

## REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 7, 2009 (the Action). Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview with Applicant's representative on November 23, 2009. This paper shall constitute an Interview Summary in accordance with MPEP 713.04. Applicants generally concur with the Interview Summary dated December 7, 2009, and agreement was not reached. However, it is noted that the rejections discussed in the telephone interview have been withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 10-16 stand rejected in the Action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,358,960 to Mak (Mak). Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mak in view of U.S. Publication No. 2009/0156178 to Elsey (Elsey).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

### **I. Independent Claims 1 and 6**

Independent Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to generally recite the subject matter of Claims 2 and 7, respectively. Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are rendered moot. The subject matter of Claims 2 and 7 is rejected in the Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mak in view of Elsey.

Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A method of selecting a number or address from a list stored in a telecommunications device for initiating a call or sending a message from the telecommunications device to the number or address, the list comprising names and one or more numbers or addresses corresponding to each name, the method comprising:

displaying a list comprising at least some of the stored names, one of the names in the list being highlighted;

the highlighted name being displayed in the list together with a default one of the one or more numbers and/or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name; and

displaying together with the default number or address an indication of whether the list comprises further numbers or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name in addition to the displayed number or address.

The Action concedes that Mak does not disclose displaying together with the default number or address an indication of whether the list comprises further numbers or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name in addition to the displayed number or address. The Action cites Elsey as allegedly disclosing this feature.

However, Elsey deals with information/call centers in which operators can effectively provide users with personalized information and communications services. *See* Mak, paragraph [0038]. An operator in Elsey may view the information for a user when the user is calling the operator in order to have corresponding information when the user is not able to access the information himself. *See* paragraphs [0045], [0065]. Applicants submit that in Elsey, data are displayed on a terminal of an operator and not on the display of a mobile phone. Consequently, the disclosures of Mak, which relates to mobile phone displays, and Elsey are not related to one another and there is no motivation to combine Mak and Elsey with any reasonable expectation of success because Elsey relates to displaying information on a standard terminal of an operator sitting in a call center and is not concerned with the size constraints of a mobile terminal. Therefore, Applicants submit that one of skill in the art would not look to combine Elsey with Mak.

In addition, Elsey does not appear to display information such as the contact information to the user of a telecommunication device that is establishing a call. In contrast, the contact information in Elsey is displayed on an operator terminal and needs to be communicated to a remote user. Therefore, even if Mak and Elsey were combined, the Mak and Elsey do not disclose that the indication of whether the list comprises further numbers or addresses is displayed together with the default number or address as recited in Claim 1 because Elsey requires that the operator communicate information from the operator's standard terminal to the remote user, and to make this combination is impermissible hindsight. Accordingly, the cited prior art also does not disclose a method of selecting a number or address from a list stored in a telecommunications device for initiating a call or sending a message as recited in Claim 1.

The Action cites paragraph [0063] of Elsey as allegedly disclosing "displaying together with the default number or address an indication of whether the list comprises further

numbers or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name." However, Claim 1 recites that for a displayed entry of a phone book, a default number or address is displayed together with an indication of further available numbers or addresses, *i.e.*, further information that is available of the same nature of the default displayed information. In contrast, in Elsey the additional information appears different from that already displayed, *e.g.*, a postal or electronic mail address. *See* paragraph [0063].

Claim 6 generally recites the subject matter discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the recitations of Claims 1 and 6 are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Mak and Elsey and request that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-16 be withdrawn.

## **II. New Claims 17-18**

New Claims 17-18 depend from Claims 1 and 6, respectfully, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. In addition, Claims 17-18 are separately patentable and recite that the default number is configured to be selected and to initiate a call directly without listing the further stored number or addresses. Support for Claims 17-18 may be found, for example, on page 10, line 16-23 of the Specification. The recitations of Claims 17-18 are also not disclosed or rendered obvious by Mak or Esley. Mak does not display an indication of whether additional numbers or addresses are stored. Esley relates to information displayed in a call or informational center in which the operator must relay information to a user, and therefore the default number cannot be configured to be selected and to initiate a call directly.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 17-18 are separately patentable and request an indication of same.

Attorney Docket No. 9561-7  
Application Serial No. 10/580,592  
Filed: January 19, 2007  
Page 9

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and the same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any small matters outstanding of resolution, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 919-854-1400 for expeditious handling.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura M. Kelley  
Registration No.: 48,441

USPTO Customer No. 20792

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec  
Post Office Box 37428  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627  
Telephone: 919/854-1400  
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

## CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 CFR §1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 8, 2010.

Signature: Joyce Pauli  
Joyce Pauli